

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 10-13 and 16-17 are amended to even more clearly distinguish over the applied reference and to correct punctuation. No new matter is added.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance (for the reasons discussed herein); (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration (as the amendments clarify the features and only incorporate what reasonably would be expected to be claimed and should already have been searched - see MPEP § 904.02); (c) do not present any additional claims; and (d) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Patel during the March 5, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

I. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied Reference

The Office Action rejects claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0001217 to Wu. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Regarding independent claims 1, 10-13 and 16-17, Wu fails to disclose (1) "wherein the instruction form is generated in advance, the instruction form and the user information being associated with each other [or the "instruction form associated with the user"]" where "the instruction form is different than any file to be processed by the instructions" (claims 1, 10-13, 16-17); (2) "a retrieval part that retrieves the instruction form accessible to the user from the instruction form management apparatus based on the received information on the user" (claims 1, 10, 16, and similarly recited in claim 13); (3) "an output part that outputs

information on the retrieved instruction form to allow the user to instruct performing a process indicated in the instruction form to one or more instruction form execution apparatuses" (claims 1, 10, and similarly recited in claim 13); and (4) "an attachment part that attaches a portable storage medium which is unique to and capable of being carried by a predetermined user" (claims 11-12) or "an attachment part that attaches a storage medium that stores at least one selectable instruction form that includes processing instructions associated with a user" (claim 17).

Wu discloses a system to allow a user to print a document 94 from a mobile device such as a web cell phone 76 (Fig. 2). In operation, when a user checks into a hotel, the user provides his or her "Internet credentials" to the hotel (paragraph [0023]). Thereafter, the user can print document 94 that is stored in web storage 90 by using the web cell phone 76 to connect to the Internet, and to access web page 88 of web site 86 (*id.*). The user uses web page 88 to enter information regarding the print job, such as the location of the document 94, the number of copies, whether to staple, etc. in a print request 96 (*id.*). The print service 70 retrieves document 94 based on the submitted information and the user's Internet credentials (paragraph [0026]) and causes the document 94 to be printed.

Wu fails to disclose features (1)-(3) quoted above because Wu discloses only that the user initiates printing by creating print request 96 that is sent to print service 70 to initiate printing of document 94. Print request 96 is not generated in advance so that it is retrieved "based on the received information on the user" because the user creates the print request 96 at the time of printing. Thus, there can be no "output part that outputs information on the retrieved instruction form [previously created for the user] to allow the user to instruct performing a process indicated in the instruction form" (comment and emphasis added).

While Examiner Patel alleged during the personal interview that Wu discloses features (1)-(3) because Wu's document 94 corresponds to the claimed instruction form, this

is incorrect because, as claimed, "the instruction form is different than any file to be processed by the instructions".

Wu fails to disclose feature (4) quoted above because Wu does not disclose that a user can store an instruction form on a portable storage medium that includes processing instructions associated with a user or that such a portable storage medium can be attached to Wu's system.

Dependent claims 2-9, 11-12 and 14-15 are patentable for the same reasons as their base claims, as well as for the additional features they recite.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/mcp

Date: March 7, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--